

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : **10/633,137** Confirmation No. **3128**
Applicant : **Muhammad Athar Shah and Michael J. Horowitz**
Filed : **August 1, 2003**
TC/A.U. : **2621**
Examiner : **Anand Shashikant Rao**
Docket No. : **199-0201US**
Customer No. : **29855**
Title : **METHODS FOR ENCODING OR DECODING IN A VIDEOCONFERENCE
SYSTEM TO REDUCE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH NOISY IMAGE
ACQUISITION**

Box Appeal Brief
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Mail Stop: Appeal Briefs – Patents

RESPONSE TO SECOND NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

This paper is filed in response to the second Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed October 13, 2009 (“the Second Notice”). The statement that “The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal...” is incorrect. Review of one rejection is sought, and exactly one sub-heading identically corresponding to this rejection is presented. *See p. 6.*

Furthermore, Appellants note that no information is missing in the white spaces on pages 8 and 12 of the brief. Moreover, Appellants further note that a casual reading the lines immediately prior to the excerpts from the cited art would make clear exactly which portions of the cited art are being reproduced. From this listing it is apparent that no information has been omitted.

These comments are submitted by way of “clarification” as requested in the Second Notice. Because there are no errors, “correction” is neither necessary nor possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

October 21 2009

Filed Electronically

/Billy C. Allen III/
Billy C. Allen, III, Reg. No. 46, 147
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
20333 State Hwy 249, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070
832-446-2409